UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,829	07/15/2003	Jason A. Trachewsky	BP2481.3	7190

51472 7590 12/08/2009

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON
P.O. BOX 160727
AUSTIN, TX 78716-0727

EXAMINER	
CAI, WAYNE HUU	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MMURDOCK@TEXASPATENTS.COM
JIVY@TEXASPATENTS.COM
SMCWHINNIE@TEXASPATENTS.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,829	TRACHEWSKY, JASON A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WAYNE CAI	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 September 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-26 and 35-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-26 and 35-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-26 and 35-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 15, 16, 18-21, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monin et al. (hereinafter "Monin", US 2002/0197984) in view of Malhotra et al. (hereinafter "Malhotra", US 7,110,374).

Regarding claim 15, Monin teaches or suggests a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) device (fig. 5 and fig. 6, control unit 28). Note: the WLAN device can be either the handset or an access point as described in the Applicant's PG Pub specification paragraph 0034 and/or stated on page 9 of Remark, comprising:

a first baseband processor interface for receiving, processing and generating digital data (fig. 5 and/or fig. 6, baseband module 1. The baseband module 1 implicitly teaches a baseband processor interface because the baseband processor must be able to connect, interact or communicate with many

other components. For example, in this case, the baseband module 1 is connected and communicated with radio module 1. Furthermore, paragraph 0005 also teaches or suggests that this invention is related to "digital data");

a first radio for receiving the digital data and for transmitting RF signals in a first frequency band according to a first communication protocol and for receiving RF signals in the first frequency band and for producing corresponding digital data to the first baseband processor interface (fig. 5 and/or fig. 6, radio module 1 is connected to the baseband module 1);

a second baseband processor interface for receiving, processing and generating digital data (fig. 5 and fig. 6, baseband module 2 is connected to radio module 2); and

a second radio for receiving the digital data and for transmitting RF signals in a second frequency band according to a second communication protocol and for receiving RF signals in the second frequency band and for producing corresponding digital data to the second baseband processor interface (fig. 5 and fig. 6, radio module 2 is connected to baseband module 2). The Examiner further notes that Monin specifically teaches or suggests the WLAN as described operating at 2.4 GHz frequency, but can also be implemented using other WLAN technologies including at different frequency bands, etc. Hence, this teaching reads on first/second frequency and first/second communication protocol.

a ~~single~~ at least one baseband processor that transmits outgoing data and receives ingoing data through the first and second baseband processor interfaces (i.e., baseband processor 40 of figure 5 or 6).

Monin, however, does not expressly teach or suggest band selection logic wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to selects a channel for a subsequent communication.

In a similar endeavor, Malhotra teaches or suggests wireless LAN with dynamic channel selection. Malhotra also teaches or suggests band selection logic wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to selects a channel for a subsequent communication (i.e., scanning and selecting a channel for operation as described at col. 3, line 43 - col. 4, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin with the teachings of Malhotra to include band selection logic wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to selects a channel for a subsequent communication.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to optimize the operation.

Regarding claim 35, Monin teaches or suggests a method for a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) device, comprising:

receiving, a first radio, digital data and transmitting RF signals in a first frequency band according to a first communication protocol and receiving RF signals in the first frequency band and producing corresponding digital data to a ~~single~~ baseband processor (fig. 5 or fig. 6, baseband module 1 and radio module 1 is connected to each other);

receiving, in a second radio, the digital data transmitting RF signals in a ~~first~~ second frequency band according to a second communication protocol and receiving RF signals in the first frequency band and producing corresponding digital data to the ~~single~~ baseband processor (fig. 5 or fig. 6, baseband module 2 and radio module 2 is connected to each other);

generating, from the ~~single~~ baseband processor, the digital data for transmission from one of the first radio, the second radio or both wherein the ~~single~~ baseband processor produces the digital data through one of a first radio interface, a second radio interface or both for transmission (i.e., baseband processor 40 of figure 5 or 6).

Monin, however, does not expressly teach or suggest scanning a plurality of channels to determine which of a plurality of frequency bands and associated communication protocols should be used for a communication.

In a similar endeavor, Malhotra teaches or suggests wireless LAN with dynamic channel selection. Malhotra also teaches or suggests scanning a plurality of channels to determine which of a plurality of frequency bands and associated communication protocols should be used for a communication (i.e.,

scanning and selecting a channel for operation as described at col. 3, line 43 - col. 4, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin with the teachings of Malhotra to include the step of scanning a plurality of channels to determine which of a plurality of frequency bands and associated communication protocols should be used for a communication.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to optimize the operation.

Regarding claims 16 and 36, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or suggests logic for determining a quality indicator, wherein the quality indicator for a selected channel considers a channel power and interference power for the selected channel (paragraphs 0066, 0068).

Regarding claims 18 and 37, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or suggests logic for selecting a communication protocol for operation from a plurality of available communication protocols (paragraph 0071).

Regarding claims 19 and 38, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or

suggests logic for selecting at least two frequency bands and communicating over at least one channel in each of the two frequency bands (paragraphs 0005, 0014 and 0071 describe using two different bands 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz).

Regarding claim 20, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin teaches or suggests the first and second radio interfaces and first and second baseband processors wherein the first baseband processor communicates with the first baseband processor interface by way of the first radio interface and the second baseband processor communicates with the second baseband processor interface by way of the second radio interface (fig. 5 illustrates baseband module 1 is connected to radio module 1 and baseband module 2 is connected to radio module 2).

Regarding claim 21, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin teaches or suggests including first and second radio interfaces wherein the first baseband processor communicates with the first baseband processor interface by way of the first radio interface and with the second baseband processor interface by way of the second radio interface (i.e., each baseband processor communicates with each of radio modules as illustrated in fig. 5 and 6).

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monin et al. (hereinafter "Monin", US 2002/0197984) in view of Malhotra et al. (hereinafter "Malhotra", US 7,110,374) as applied to claims 15 and 16 above, and further in view of Brandstetter (US 5,005,946).

Regarding claim 17, Monin and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above, but do not expressly teach or suggest wherein the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel interference.

In a similar endeavor, Brandstetter teaches or suggests a method for multi-channel filtering system. Brandstetter also teaches or suggests wherein the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel interference (col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin and Malhotra's teachings and include the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to optimize the operation.

5. Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monin et al. (hereinafter "Monin", US 2002/0197984) in view of

Agrawal et al. (hereinafter "Agrawal", US 2003/0108005) and further in view of Malhotra et al. (hereinafter "Malhotra", US 7,110,374).

Regarding claim 22, Monin teaches or suggests a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) device, comprising:

a first radio for receiving the digital data and for transmitting RF signals in a first frequency band and for receiving RF signals in the first frequency band and for producing corresponding digital data to the at least baseband processor interface (fig. 5 and fig. 6, radio module 1);

a second radio for receiving the digital data and for transmitting RF signals in a first frequency band and for receiving RF signals in the first frequency band and for producing corresponding digital data to the at least baseband processor interface (fig. 5 and fig. 6, radio module 2);

first and second baseband processor interfaces operably coupled to first and second radios that communicate according to first and second communication protocols (fig. 5, and fig. 6 illustrates the first baseband module 1 and baseband module 2 couple to the first and second radios, respectively. Hence, these baseband modules implicitly include first and second baseband processor interfaces because each of the baseband module must be able to communicate with all other components). Note: The Examiner further notes that Monin specifically teaches or suggests the WLAN as described operating at 2.4 GHz frequency, but can also be implemented using other WLAN technologies including at different frequency bands, etc. Hence, this teaching reads on first communication protocol and second communication protocol;

wherein the first and second radio interfaces are operably coupled to communicate with the first and second baseband processor interfaces (fig. 5 and/or fig. 6 illustrate baseband module 1 and radio module 1 is connected to each other. Similarly, baseband module 2 is connected to radio module 2. Thus, they implicitly include these interfaces to make them to be compatible and be able to communicate with each other);

wherein the baseband processor generates digital data for transmission from one of the first radio, the second radio or both wherein the baseband processor produces the digital data through one of the first radio interface, the second radio interface or both for transmission (i.e., the baseband module is connected and communicated with the radio module);

wherein the baseband processor, the first and second radios, the first and second baseband processor interfaces, first and second radio interface are all a part of a single WLAN device (all the components as recited in this limitation is located within one device. That is, control unit 28. See fig. 5 and fig. 6). The Examiner further notes that Monin specifically teaches or suggests the WLAN as described operating at 2.4 GHz frequency. This means that the device is operating at one frequency which is the first frequency as recited in claim.

Monin, however, does not expressly teach or suggest:

a single baseband processor for receiving, processing and generating digital data; and

wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to select a channel for a subsequent communication.

In a similar endeavor, Agrawal teaches or suggests frequency hop collision avoidance in a multi-channel Bluetooth-enabled packet transmission system. Agrawal also teaches or suggests a single baseband processor (i.e., fig. 1, a single baseband controller 17) for receiving, processing and generating digital data (i.e., the single baseband controller 17 connects to the plurality of radio modules 14, 15, 16 that is capable of receiving, processing and generating digital data. See paragraph 0005 for the teachings of digital data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin with the teachings of Agrawal to include a single baseband processor for receiving, processing and generating digital data, in order to enable the plural channels to be activated for simultaneous transmission.

Furthermore, Malhotra teaches or suggests wireless LAN with dynamic channel selection. Malhotra also teaches or suggests band selection logic wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to selects a channel for a subsequent communication (i.e., scanning and selecting a channel for operation as described at col. 3, line 43 - col. 4, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin and Agrawal and include the band selection logic wherein the WLAN device scans a plurality of channels in the first and second frequency bands transmitted according to the first and second communication protocols to selects a channel for a subsequent communication.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to optimize the operation.

Regarding claim 23, Monin, Agrawal and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or suggests logic for determining a quality indicator, wherein the quality indicator for a selected channel considers a channel power and interference power for the selected channel (paragraphs 0066, 0068).

Regarding claim 25, Monin, Agrawal and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or suggests logic for selecting a communication protocol for operation from a plurality of available communication protocols (paragraph 0071).

Regarding claim 26, Monin, Agrawal and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above. Monin also teaches or suggests logic for selecting at least two frequency bands and communicating

over at least one channel in each of the two frequency bands (paragraphs 0005, 0014 and 0071 describe using two different bands 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz).

6. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monin et al. (hereinafter "Monin", US 2002/0197984) in view of Agrawal et al. (hereinafter "Agrawal", US 2003/0108005) and Malhotra et al. (hereinafter "Malhotra", US 7,110,374) as applied to claims 15 and 16 above, and further in view of Brandstetter (US 5,005,946).

Regarding claim 24, Monin, Agrawal and Malhotra teach or suggest all limitations recited within claims as described above, but do not expressly teach or suggest wherein the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel interference.

In a similar endeavor, Brandstetter teaches or suggests a method for multi-channel filtering system. Brandstetter also teaches or suggests wherein the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel interference (col. 8, line 67 – col. 9, line 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Monin, Agrawal and Malhotra's teachings and include the interference power includes in-channel interference and adjacent channel.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to optimize the operation.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WAYNE CAI whose telephone number is (571)272-7798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Wayne Cai/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617